

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Please make the following changes as indicated below. Two sheets of replacement drawings are attached.

Specifically, the figures have been amended to make all lines uniformly thick, and to standardize the lettering. Additionally, new figure 2 has been added to comply with the examiner's requirement that the figures must reflect that the lower and upper tongues may be conic shaped, as recited in claims 3 and 5.

## **REMARKS**

This reply is responsive to the office action dated January 26, 2005. Upon entry of this amendment claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 – 9 have been amended, and new dependent claims 10-20 have been added. No new matter has been added, and the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

In the official action, the examiner:

- Objected to the drawings;
- Objected to the information disclosure statement;
- Objected to claim 7 due to informalities;
- Rejected claims 1, 2 and 4 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 3,377,514 to Ruehlemann et al. ("the Ruehlemann patent");
- Rejected claims 3, 5 and 6-9 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Ruehlmann patent.

## **Objections**

### **Drawings**

The drawings are objected to as having lines that are not uniformly thick, and as having non-standard lettering. The drawings are also objected to as not showing the lower and upper tongues having a conic shape, as per claims 3 and 5.

Two sheet of replacement drawings is provided. Specifically, Figures 1a, 1b and 1c have been amended to incorporate uniform line thicknesses, and to standardize the lettering and numbering throughout the figures. Additionally, new figure 2 has been added to comply with the examiner's requirement that the figures must reflect that the lower and upper tongues may be conic shaped, as recited in claims 3 and 5.

Thus, applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The information disclosure statement was objected to because it showed a different docket number and filing date. A new information disclosure statement, and accompanying PTO-1449 form are enclosed herewith, thus applicants request this objection be withdrawn, and that the references identified in the PTO-1449 be made of record in this application.

### **Claim 7**

Claim 7 stands objected to, since it is not clear which "tongue" is being referred to, whether lower or upper. Claim 7 has been amended to recite "sliding the means in the direction ...," instead of "sliding the tongue in the direction ...." Thus applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

### **Rejections**

#### **Claims 1, 2 and 4**

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Ruehlmann patent.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"An assembly, comprising:  
a grooved frame having a lower side recess and an upper side recess, and  
an interfitting tongue having a lower tongue portion and an upper tongue portion, and further having an electronic device mounted thereon,  
whereby the lower side recess is configured to contact the lower tongue portion, and the upper side recess is configured to engage the upper tongue portion, such that when the lower tongue portion contacts the lower side recess, the interfitting tongue is movable in a first direction within the lower side recess so that the upper side recess engages the upper tongue portion to thereby lock the interfitting tongue to the grooved frame."

The Ruehlemann patent does not anticipate independent claim 1 because it fails to disclose "a grooved frame having a lower side recess and an upper side recess, and an interfitting tongue having a lower tongue portion and an upper tongue portion, and further having an electronic device mounted thereon, whereby the lower side recess is configured to contact the lower tongue portion, and the upper side recess is configured to engage the upper tongue portion, such that when the lower tongue portion contacts the lower side recess, the interfitting tongue is movable in a first direction within both the lower side recess and the upper side recess so that the upper side recess engages the upper tongue."

Rather, the Ruehlemann patent discloses a plurality of contact fingers **38** with each finger including a flattened rear portion **40**, an upwardly projecting portion **42** and a downwardly bent flange **44**. (See the Ruehlemann patent, col. 3, lines 25-33 and Figures 1 and 10). A plurality of openings **48** is formed in carrier plate 22, and each contact finger 38 includes a vertically extending portion **50** which passes through an opening 48. (See *id.*, col. 3, lines 35-38 and Fig. 1). A horizontal flange 52 projects from the bottom of portion **50**, and each flange **52** is secured to a printed electrical lead 30 in any suitable manner, such as by soldering. (*Id.*, col. 3, lines 36-39 and Fig. 1). Thus, even if the Ruehlemann openings **48** were to be considered the "lower side recess" or the "upper side recess" of claim 1, and the contact finger **38** considered to be the "lower tongue portion" or "upper tongue portion," the Ruehlemann contact finger **38** still is not "movable in a first direction within ... the ... recess," because the horizontal flange **52** prevents movement of the contact finger **38** within the opening **48**.

Thus, because the Ruehlemann patent fails to disclose every element of claim 1, applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection be withdrawn and that the claim be allowed. With respect to claims 2 and 4, which depend from claim 1, and recite additional features of the invention, applicant's request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections of these claims be withdrawn for the same reasons as stated for claim 1.

### **Claims 3 and 5**

Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Ruehlmann patent. Claims 3 and 5 depend from independent claim 1, and thus contain all of the limitations of that claim.

Thus, for the same reasons stated above in regards to the non-anticipation of claim 1 by the Ruehlmann patent, applicants believe claim 3 and 5 are patentable over the cited reference. Specifically, the Ruehlmann patent does not disclose, teach or suggest “a grooved frame having a lower side recess and an upper side recess, and an interfitting tongue having a lower tongue portion and an upper tongue portion, and further having an electronic device mounted thereon, whereby the lower side recess is configured to contact the lower tongue portion, and the upper side recess is configured to engage the upper tongue portion, such that when the lower tongue portion contacts the lower side recess, the interfitting tongue is movable in a first direction within both the lower side recess and the upper side recess so that the upper side recess engages the upper tongue,” as required by claim 1.

Thus, because the Ruehlmann patent fails to disclose, teach or suggest every limitation of claims 3 and 5, applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of these claims be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed.

#### **Claims 6-9**

Claims 6 -9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Ruehlmann patent.

Independent claim 6 has been amended to recite:

“A method of mounting a device onto a surface comprising the steps of:  
interfitting a means having a lower tongue and an upper tongue, into a grooved frame having a lower side recess and an upper side recess;  
sliding the lower tongue into engagement with the lower side recess; and  
sliding the means within the lower side recess in the direction of the upper side recess, to engage the upper tongue with the upper

side recess thereby locking the means into position in the grooved frame.”

Independent claim 8 has been amended to recite:

“A method of assembly comprising the steps of:  
mounting an electronic device onto an insertion means said insertion means having a tongue comprising a lower tongue portion and an upper tongue portion;  
interfitting the insertion means into a grooved frame having a lower side recess and an upper side recess;  
engaging the lower tongue portion with the lower side recess in the grooved frame; and  
sliding the tongue within the lower side recess in the direction of the upper side recess, causing the groove to receive the upper tongue portion, thereby locking the insertion means to the grooved frame.”

Independent claims 6 and 8 are patentable over the Ruehlmann patent because the reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest “interfitting a means having a lower tongue and an upper tongue, into a grooved frame having a lower side recess and an upper side recess; sliding the lower tongue into engagement with the lower side recess; and sliding the means within the lower side recess in the direction of the upper side recess, to engage the upper tongue with the upper side recess thereby locking the means into position in the grooved frame” as required by claim 6; or “mounting an electronic device onto an insertion means said insertion means having a tongue comprising a lower tongue portion and an upper tongue portion; interfitting the insertion means into a grooved frame having a lower side recess and an upper side recess; engaging the lower tongue portion with the lower side recess in the grooved frame; and sliding the tongue within the lower side recess in the direction of the upper side recess, causing the groove to receive the upper tongue portion, thereby locking the insertion means to the grooved frame,” as required by claim 8.

Rather, as noted with respect to claim 1 above, the Ruehlmann patent discloses a plurality of contact fingers **38** with each finger including a flattened rear portion **40**, an upwardly projecting portion **42** and a downwardly bent flange **44**. (See the Ruehle mann patent, col. 3, lines 25-33 and Figures 1 and 10). A plurality of openings **48** is formed in

carrier plate 22, and each contact finger 38 includes a vertically extending portion 50 which passes through an opening 48. (See *id.*, col. 3, lines 35-38 and Fig. 1). A horizontal flange 52 projects from the bottom of portion 50, and each flange 52 is secured to a printed electrical lead 30 in any suitable manner, such as by soldering. (*Id.*, col. 3, lines 36-39 and Fig. 1). Thus, even if the Ruehlemann openings 48 were to be considered the "lower side recess" or the "upper side recess" of claim 1, and the contact finger 38 considered to be the "lower tongue portion" or "upper tongue portion," the Ruehlemann contact finger 38 still is not capable of "sliding ... within the lower side recess in the direction of the upper side recess," as required by claims 6 and 8, because the horizontal flange 52 prevents movement of the contact finger 38 within the opening 48.

Thus, because the Ruehmann patent fails to disclose, teach or suggest every limitation of independent claims 6 and 8, applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of these claims be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed. With respect to claims 7 and 9, which depend from claims 6 and 8, respectively, and which recite additional features of the invention, applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of these claims be withdrawn for the same reasons as stated for claims 6 and 8.

#### **New Claims 10-20**

New claims 10-13 depend from independent claim 1, and thus contain all of the limitations of that claim. Thus, for the same reasons stated above in relation to independent claim 1, applicants believe that new claims 10-13 are allowable.

New claims 14-17 depend from independent claim 6, and thus contain all of the limitations of that claim. Thus, for the same reasons stated above in relation to independent claim 6, applicants believe that new claims 14-17 are allowable.

New claims 18-20 depend from independent claim 8, and thus contain all of the limitations of that claim. Thus, for the same reasons stated above in relation to independent claim 8, applicants believe that new claims 10-13 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

No fees are deemed due with this response, however, should any fees be required, the Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any such required fees to deposit account **50-2061**.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey M. Chamberlain, Esq.

Reg. No. 55,044

DUANE MORRIS LLP

P.O. Box 5203

Princeton, NJ 08543-5203

Date: July 15, 2005

Docket No: E0523-00016

Tel: (609) 631-2491

Fax: (609) 631-2401

mailto:jmchamberlain@duanemorris.com